1-1

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation)	
Against:)	
)	
THOMAS BORUT, M.D.)	File No: 06-1995-51067
Certificate #G-25587	Ò	
)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

DECISION AND ORDER

The Stipulated Settlement and Decision is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on June 4, 1999.

DATED June 4, 1999

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Ira Lubell, M.D., President Division of Medical Quality

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General 1 of the State of California 2 RICHARD D. MARINO (State Bar No. 90471) Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 3 300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 4 Los Angeles, California 90013-1233 Telephone: (213) 897-8644 5 Attorneys for Complainant 6 7 BEFORE THE 8 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAŁ BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA In the Matter of the Accusation Case No. 06-95-51067 11 OAH No. L-1998060130 Against: 12 THOMAS BORUT, M.D. STIPULATED SETTLEMENT **AND** 6151 W. Century Blvd., Ste. 200 13 DISCIPLINARY ORDER Los Angeles, California 90948 14 Physician and Surgeon's Certificate 15 No. G25587, Respondent. 16 17 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the 18 parties to the above-entitled proceedings that the following 19 20 matters are true: 21 **PARTIES** Complainant Ron Joseph is the Executive Director 1. 22 of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer 23 Affairs, State of California (hereinafter the "Board") and 24 brought this action solely in his official capacity. Complainant 25 26 is represented by the Attorney General of California, Bill Lockyer, by and through Deputy Attorney General Richard D. Marino. 27

3. At all times relevant herein, respondent has been licensed by the Board under Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. G25587.

JURISDICTION

- 4. An Accusation in case number 06-95-51067 was filed with the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California (hereinafter the "Division") on or about February 25, 1998, and is currently pending against respondent.
- 5. The Accusation, together with all statutorily required documents, was duly served on the respondent on or about February 25, 1998, and respondent filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation on or about March 2, 1998. A true and accurate copy of Accusation No. 06-95-51067 is hereto attached, marked as Exhibit 1, and, by this reference, incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- 6. Respondent and his attorney have fully read and discussed the charges contained in Accusation No. 06-95-51067. Respondent has been fully advised regarding his legal rights and the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.

ADVISEMENT OF RIGHTS AND WAIVER

7. Respondent understands the nature of the charges alleged in the Accusation and that, if proven at hearing, the

charges and allegations would constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate.

Respondent is fully aware of his right to a hearing on the charges contained in the Accusation, his right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against him, his right to the use of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents in both defense and mitigation of the charges, his right to reconsideration, court review and any and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.

8. Respondent knowingly, voluntarily and irrevocably waives and gives up each of these rights.

DISPOSITION OF CHARGES

9. For the purpose of resolving Accusation No. 06-95-51067 without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, respondent agrees that, at a hearing, complainant could establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation, and respondent hereby gives up his right to contest those charges.

CIRCUMSTANCES IN MITIGATION

10. Respondent has never been the subject of disciplinary action. He is board certified in pediatrics and immunology. Accusation No. 06-95-51067 alleges conduct in 1990-91 which resulted in the only malpractice suit in respondent's 27 year career. Other than the allegations in the accusation, the Board has received no other complaints regarding respondent.

RESERVATION

- 11. The stipulations made by respondent herein are for the purpose of this proceeding and any other proceedings in which the Medical Board of California or other professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be admissible in any other criminal or civil proceedings.
- 12. Based on the foregoing stipulated matters, the parties agree that the Division shall, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

1.5

Certificate No. G25587, issued to THOMAS BORUT, M.D. is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for 35 months, on the following terms and conditions. Within 15 days after the effective date of this decision the respondent shall provide the Division, or its designee, proof of service that respondent has served a true copy of this decision on the Chief of Staff or the Chief Executive Officer at every hospital where privileges or membership are extended to respondent or where respondent is employed to practice medicine and on the Chief Executive Officer at every insurance carrier where malpractice insurance coverage is extended to respondent.

- 1. Ethics Course Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall enroll in a course in Ethics approved in advance by the Division or its designee, and shall successfully complete the course during the first year of probation.
- 2. **Psychiatric Evaluation** Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and on a periodic basis thereafter as may be required by the Division or its designee, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric evaluation (and psychological testing, if deemed necessary) by a Division-appointed psychiatrist, who shall furnish an evaluation report to the Division or its designee. The respondent shall pay the cost of the psychiatric evaluation.

If respondent is required by the Division or its

designee to undergo psychiatric treatment to ensure patient safety, respondent shall within 30 days of the requirement notice submit to the Division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice.

Respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the Division or its designee. Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the Division or its designee indicating whether the respondent is capable of practicing medicine safely.

. 3

. 10

- 3. Third Party Presence During probation, respondent shall have a third party present while examining or treating female patients. Respondent shall, within 30 days of the effective date of the decision, submit to the Division or its designee for its approval name(s) of persons who will act as the third party present. The respondent shall execute a release authorizing the third party(s) present to divulge any information that the Division may request during interviews by the probation monitor on a periodic basis.
- 4. Obey All Laws Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, all rules governing the practice of medicine in California, and remain in full compliance with any court ordered criminal probation, payments and other orders.
- 5. Quarterly Reports Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.
 - 6. Probation Surveillance Program Compliance Respondent shall

comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.

Respondent shall, at all times, keep the Division informed of his addresses of business and residence which shall both serve as addresses of record. Changes of such addresses shall be immediately communicated in writing to the Division. Under no circumstances shall a post office box serve as an address of record.

Respondent shall also immediately inform the Division, in writing, of any travel to any areas outside the jurisdiction of California which lasts, or is contemplated to last, more than 30 days.

- 7. Interview With the Division, Its Designee or Its Designated

 Physicians(s) Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with
 the Division, its designee or its designated physician(s) upon
 request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.
- Practice In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the State or for any reason should respondent stop practicing medicine in California, respondent shall notify the Division or its designee in writing within ten days of the dates of departure and return or the dates of non-practice within California. Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding thirty days in which respondent is not engaging in any activities defined in Sections 2051 and 2052 of the Business and Professions Code. All time spent in an intensive training program approved by the Division or its designee shall be considered as time spent in the practice of

medicine. Periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside California or of non-practice within California, as defined in this condition, will not apply to the reduction of the probationary period.

1.0

- 9. **Completion of Probation** Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate shall be fully restored.
- probation in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.
- 11. Cost Recovery The respondent is hereby ordered to reimburse the Division the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000.00) within one (1) year from the effective date of this decision for its investigative and prosecution costs. Failure to reimburse the Division's cost of its investigation and prosecution shall constitute a violation of the probation order, unless the Division agrees in writing to payment by an installment plan because of financial hardship. The filing of bankruptcy by the respondent shall not relieve the respondent of his/her responsibility to reimburse the Division for its investigative and prosecution costs.
- 12. **Probation Costs** The respondent shall pay the costs associated with probation monitoring each and every year of

probation, which are currently set at \$2,304 but may be adjusted on an annual basis. Such costs shall be payable to the Division of Medical Quality at the beginning of each calendar year.

Failure to pay costs within 30 days of the due date shall constitute a violation of probation.

1.5

this decision, if respondent ceases practicing due to retirement, health reasons or is otherwise unable to satisfy the terms and conditions of probation, respondent may voluntarily tender his certificate to the Board. The Division reserves the right to evaluate the respondent's request and to exercise its discretion whether to grant the request, or to take any other action deemed appropriate and reasonable under the circumstances. Upon formal acceptance of the tendered license, respondent will no longer be subject to terms and conditions of probation.

CONTINGENCY

This stipulation shall be subject to the approval of the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California. Respondent understands and agrees that staff and counsel for complainant may communicate directly with the Division regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to or participation by respondent or his counsel. If the Division fails to adopt this stipulation as its Order, the stipulation shall be of no force or effect, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Division shall not be disqualified from further action in this matter by virtue of its consideration of this stipulation.

ACCEPTANCE

I have read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I have fully discussed the terms and conditions and other matters contained therein with my attorney, Mark Levin. I understand the effect this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order will have on my Physician and Surgeon's Certificate, and agree to be bound thereby. I enter this stipulation freely, knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily.

DATED: 4/6/99

Respondent

I have read and fully discussed the terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order with respondent THOMAS BORUT, M.D., and approve of its form and content.

Attorney for Respondent

DATED: 4/2/99

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary
Order is hereby respectfully submitted for the consideration of
the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California,
Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California,

DATED: <u>April 1, 1999</u>.

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California

RICHARD D. MARINO Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Complainant

Exhibit: Accusation

,

DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General FILED 1 of the State of California STATE OF CALIFORNIA KAREN B. CHAPPELLE, State Bar No. 141267 2 MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice SACRAMENTO ZOLLONI 2 3 300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 Los Angeles, California 90013-1233 Telephone: (213) 897-8944 5 Attorneys for Complainant 6 7 BEFORE THE 8 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 Case No. 06-95-51067 In the Matter of the Accusation 11 Against: 12 ACCUSATION THOMAS BORUT, M.D. 6151 West Century Blvd. Suite 200 13 Los Angeles, California 90048 14 Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 25587, 15 Respondent. 16 17 18 The Complainant alleges: 19 **PARTIES** 20 Ron Joseph ("Complainant") brings this accusation 1. 21 solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the 22 Medical Board of California (hereinafter the "Board"). 23 On or about September 6, 1973, Physician and 24 Surgeon's Certificate No. G 25587 was issued by the Board to 25 Thomas Borut, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent"). At all times 26 relevant to the charges brought herein, this license has been in full force and effect. Unless renewed, it will expire on March 31, 1999.

JURISDICTION

- 3. This accusation is brought before the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs (hereinafter the "Division"), under the authority of the following sections of the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter the "Code"):
 - A. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his license revoked, be suspended for a period not to exceed one year, be placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or have such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Division deems proper.
 - B. Section 2234 of the Code provides the Division shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. Unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - *(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of this chapter.
 - *(b) Gross negligence.
 - "(c) Repeated negligent acts.
 - (d) Incompetence.

- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon. . . . "
 - C. Section 726 of the Code provides as follows:

abuse, misconduct, or relations with a patient, client, or customer constitutes unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action for any person licensed under this division, under any initiative act referred to in this division and under Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 9000) of Division 3....

- D. Section 729 of the Code provides in pertinent part:
 - psychotherapist, . . . or any person holding himself or herself out to be a physician and surgeon, psychotherapist, . . . who engages in an act of sexual intercourse, sodomy, oral copulation, or sexual contact with a patient or client, or with a former patient or client when the relationship was terminated primarily for the purpose of engaging in those acts, unless the physician and surgeon, psychotherapist, . . . has referred the

*For purposes of subdivision (a), in no instance shall consent of the patient or client be a defense. However, physicians and surgeons shall not be guilty of sexual exploitation for touching any intimate part of a patient or client unless the touching is outside the scope of medical examination and treatment, or the touching is done for sexual gratification. . . .

- "(3) 'Sexual contact' means sexual intercourse or the touching of an intimate part of a patient for the purpose of sexual arousal, gratification, or abuse. . . . "
- E. Section 125.3 of the Code provides that the Division may request the administrative law judge to direct any licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay the Division a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

F. Section 16.01 of the 1997/1998 Budget Act of the State of California provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

- "(a) No funds appropriated by this act
 may be expended to pay any Medi-Cal claim for
 any service performed by a physician while
 that physician's license is under suspension
 or revocation due to disciplinary action of
 the Medical Board of California.
- may be expended to pay any Medi-Cal claim for any surgical services or other invasive procedure performed on any Medi-Cal beneficiary by a physician if that physician has been placed on probation due to a disciplinary action of the Medical Board of California related to the performance of that specific service or procedure on any patient, except in any case where the board makes a determination during its disciplinary process that there exist compelling circumstances that warrant continued Medi-Cal reimbursement during the probationary period. . . "

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

4. Respondent, Thomas Borut, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (b) of the Code in that he committed acts of gross negligence in his care and treatment of patient C.L. The facts and circumstances are as follows:

A. FACTS

- 1. On or about March 12, 1990, patient C.L. saw respondent, a general practitioner, at Sunrise Medical Clinic with complaints of muscle spasms, bones cracking, aches and pains, insomnia, nervousness, and her breasts filling up with milk. Respondent diagnosed her as having severe anxiety reaction and prescribed Ativan.
- 2. Patient C.L. continued seeing respondent for several months at the Sunrise Clinic and, also, the Airport Clinic for various medical problems, including rashes and infections. When she became upset and cried because of all her medical problems, respondent would hug her.
- 3. About May or June 1990, respondent recommended psychological counseling to patient C.L. When she indicated she could not afford to pay for counseling, respondent told her he had done counseling in the past and suggested she contact him at his hotel if she needed someone to talk to.

^{1.} All patient references in this pleading are by initials only. The true name of the patient shall be revealed to respondent upon his request for discovery pursuant to Government Code section 11507.6.

He told her he would see her at the hotel because he could not give her enough time at the clinic. Respondent told her he would not charge her for the counseling sessions. Patient C.L. thought she needed counseling for personal issues and because she thought she was dying.

- 4. From about July 1990 until March 1991, patient
 C.L. saw respondent for therapy at the Doubletree Hotel in
 Orange County. A personal, intimate and sexual relationship
 developed.
- week with respondent at the Doubletree Hotel. The sessions lasted about one to one and a half hours. On occasion, the sessions lasted two to three hours. Patient C.L. discussed her personal problems and background of abuse with respondent. According to the patient's perceptions, a psychotherapist-patient relationship was established. No records were kept of the counseling sessions.
- 6. During these counseling sessions, respondent often said to patient C.L. "I will never hurt you, little one" and told her she was safe with him. Respondent told C.L. that she was asexual and incapable of loving anyone, and asked her sexual questions. She often cried during the sessions and respondent would hug her.
- 7. During one session at the hotel, respondent applied pressure to C.L.'s breast, fluid came out, respondent tasted it and said it was definitely milk. He

- 8. On one occasion, respondent drew a bath for C.L. in the spa located in the hotel suite because he thought she needed to relax. Respondent then got into the spa with her. Both he and the patient were nude.
- 9. When the patient complained to respondent about the cracks on her tongue, he kissed her and inserted his tongue in her mouth, and saying, "If the doctor kisses you, you must be okay because he would not make himself sick."
- 10. Respondent had patient C.L. stay overnight at the hotel so he could "figure out" her nightmares. He also gave her medication to help her sleep.
- C.L. that he loved her, she felt sick, nauseated and overwhelmed. During another session, he told her he would be honored if she had a child with him. Those statements caused her problems and confusion.
 - more than once. Respondent also performed oral sex on patient C.L. The patient thought if respondent performed oral sex on her, it meant she was not going to die. It made her feel safe. She also performed oral sex on respondent.
 - 13. While she was receiving therapy sessions from respondent, and during the time they were having a sexual relationship, respondent continued to provide patient C.L. with medical treatment. This treatment consisted of the

following: examination by respondent of the spots on her tongue; a pelvic examination; checking her arms; giving her Vicodin after she had dental work; drawing blood from her arm when she complained of a sore throat; sending the vial of blood to the lab; and giving her antibiotics for strep throat. Respondent ordered and reviewed blood work for patient C.L. on or about October 19, 1990.

14. Patient C.L. always referred to respondent as "Dr. Borut." She perceived him as a physician who was taking care of her. She thought she was receiving psychological counseling from respondent. She did not protest the sexual relationship with respondent because this relationship made

her feel better and more adequate.

- respondent wanted to end the relationship. In late 1991 and early 1992, respondent began to postpone and cancel appointments with patient C.L. She began to panic and feel insecure. She went to counseling sessions at a Los Angeles clinic for a while. Eventually, patient C.L. saw another therapist and was diagnosed with chronic post-traumatic stress disorder.
- 16. About December 1991, patient C.L. went to Olive View Hospital to see a doctor about her breast leakage.

 About 1993, after having an MRI performed, a pituitary tumor was detected on the back of the patient's neck.

B. ACTS OF GROSS NEGLIGENCE

During his care and treatment of C.L., respondent committed the following acts and omissions, which, singularly and collectively constitute gross negligence:

- 1. Respondent violated the boundaries of the physician-patient relationship by kissing and hugging patient C.L.
- 2. Respondent violated the boundaries of the physician-patient by relationship by engaging in a sexual relationship with patient C.L.
- 3. There was no termination of the physician-patient relationship before beginning the sexual relationship.

 Respondent continued to provide medical examinations, treatment, and medications for patient C.L. during the time he saw her at the hotel.
- 4. Respondent sexually exploited patient C.L. who believed that if she engaged in sexual activity with respondent, then she was "okay" and was not going to die. Respondent led patient C.L. to believe that sexual activity was part of her treatment.
- 5. Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for patient C.L.
- 6. The sexual relationship between respondent and patient C.L. caused the patient to become confused, anxious, and depressed, and contributed to her psychiatric problems.

10.

- 7. When respondent abandoned patient C.L., she suffered anxiety and depression which led to suicidal ideas and post traumatic stress symptoms.
- 8. Respondent failed to refer the patient to an independent, objective therapist.
- 9. Respondent failed to evaluate and conduct proper testing to determine the cause of patient C.L.'s complaint of galactorrhea.
- 10. When patient C.L. complained of galactorrhea, respondent failed to obtain her medical records from the obstetrician/gynecologist who had previously done a work-up on her for galactorrhea.
- 11. Respondent failed to check patient C.L.'s prolactin level to rule out hyperprolactinemia.
- 12. Respondent dismissed the patient's complaint galactorrhea as being due to her silicone breast implants.
- 13. Respondent failed to refer the patient to a specialist regarding her complaint of galactorrhea.
- 14. Respondent failed to diagnose the patient's galactorrhea as being due to a pituitary tumor.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

5. Respondent, Thomas Borut, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (c) of the Code in that he committed repeated negligent acts in the care, management and treatment of patient C.L. as alleged in

paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Ī

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Incompetence)

disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (d) of the Code in that he committed acts of incompetence in the care, management and treatment of patient C.L. as alleged in paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

- (Sexual Abuse or Misconduct)

7. Respondent, Thomas Borut, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 726 of the Code in that he committed acts of sexual abuse or misconduct with patient C.L. as alleged in paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Sexual Exploitation)

8. Respondent, Thomas Borut, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 729 of the Code in that he engaged in acts of sexual exploitation with patient C.L. as alleged in paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Records)

9. Respondent, Thomas Borut, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2266 of the Code in that failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for patient C.L. as alleged in paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Commission of Dishonest or Corrupt Acts)

disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (e) of the Code in that he engaged in dishonest or corrupt acts in the care, management and treatment of patient C.L. as alleged in paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct)

11. Respondent, Thomas Borut, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Code in that he engaged in unprofessional conduct in the care, management and treatment of patient C.L. as alleged in paragraph 4, subparagraphs A & B, inclusive, of this accusation, which is incorporated herein by reference.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held in this matter and that following the hearing, the Division issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Physician and Surgeon's Certificate Number G 25587 that was issued to respondent Thomas Borut, M.D.;
- 2. Ordering respondent to pay the Division the actual and reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and, if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;
- 3. Taking such other and further action as the Division deems necessary and proper.

DATED: February 25, 1998

Ron Joseph
Executive Director
Medical Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California

Complainant